Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In connection with the foregoing paper it may be of interest to note that a definite plan for coöperation has been formulated by the instructors in the American Museum of Natural History and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. A series of four lectures, having the unity of a course, has been arranged for the elementary schools and will be modified to suit the more advanced students in high schools. Two of the lectures will be given in the American Museum and will be illustrated by slides and moving pictures. The Metropolitan Museum will show models and actual objects, in addition to slides, at the lectures which will be given here. Another phase of the plans for collaboration is connected with the work for blind children. The classes for the blind in the public schools have been visiting the American Museum in small groups for talks and intimate discussion of objects which may be handled. Following two of these discussions—of life in China or among the North American Indians—the Metropolitan Museum will give the blind children two story-hours, when Miss Chandler will entertain them with Indian legends and a Chinese story. An announcement of the lectures and story-hours may be read on page 194 of this issue.

NON-TECHNICAL LABORATORY WORK FOR THE STUDENT OF THE HISTORY OF ART[1]

In discussing this question, I have assumed that the term non-technical laboratory work may properly be applied to laboratory drawing in which the object has been to develop the power of observation, not to achieve technical proficiency. "The term 'laboratory work,' borrowed from the sciences, is not a misnomer here," says Professor Moore of Mount Holyoke. "In science the laboratory forms the basis of theory; facts are observed, and by inductive and deductive reasoning general principles are from them affirmed. In a study of historical art, too, laboratory work is used as a method of close analysis. Such work should be not merely an accompaniment but an organic part of the study of history of art. Our purpose in its use is to enable the student to devote his attention for a time to one or another feature of a picture . . . the student tries, by drawing or modeling, to copy or suggest these points, and in so trying he is obliged to analyze them with a peculiar concentration that he would hardly attain by any other method."

This reveals an attitude differing fundamentally from that shown in the methods of a decade ago when "the question of art was often confused with a question of facts." The older teaching was encyclopedic, historical, and emotional; it failed in intellectual analysis, and lacked emphasis upon aesthetic qualities.

The teacher of the history of art has still to contend with survivals of the old attitude, and this will continue to be the case until the standards for training in this subject are maintained at an equal level with those in other departments of education. A teacher of history of art in a well-known school near New York came to me several times last year for advice, and finally she said quite frankly, "I really know very little about art. There is not another subject that I should think of teaching with so inadequate a preparation." The fact that persons are teaching this subject who, according to their own statements, are so inadequately trained is a challenge to those in the colleges and higher institutions.

The belief is held today that the teaching of art must be scientific in method, and that it must give the student a realization of aesthetic values and a knowledge of the language by means of which the artist expresses his thought. Baldwin Brown says, "The thought [in art] is so intimately bound up with the *expression* that the two are really one," and he adds, "in so far as we may be able to disengage the thought from the *expression* it is not artistic thought."

The study of this form of expression, I believe, should not differ essentially from that of music or literature. The work itself must speak directly to the observer without any intermediary. The art student should be encouraged to make his own investigations and to draw his independent conclusions from analysis of the masterpiece itself. He may examine the structure of the picture in the same way that he would examine the structure of a symphony, he may look for the idioms of the painter or draughtsman and learn to recognize them as he would recognize the turns of speech which characterize the style of a great writer.

---

[1] Abridgment of a paper by Miss Abbot read before the College Art Association of America on April 6, 1917, and to be included in their Proceedings. Published here by permission.

In any such analysis, I consider the use of drawing to be invaluable. With the student and beginner drawing has the important advantage of holding the attention focused upon the object for an appreciable time. The beginner is too unpractised to know how to study a picture—his look is astonishingly superficial, and this he discovers for himself in laboratory study, as numberless comments of students prove. The advantage of drawing is well stated in the following: "The habit of using a pencil fixes the gaze a little longer on the subject in the direction of the form, which is the essential part, rather than on the accessories of history, the influence of other artists, and other more or less true embroideries of the great fact that this picture is composed of beautiful and related masses. The very contrast between the onlooker's ignorant grasp and the artist's insight is thus slowly revealed and a deeper reverence for good lines and exquisite relations is built up."

Let us consider the advantage of laboratory drawing in the study of composition, which might be called the study of the interrelation of the parts. The untrained eye finds the plan of composition difficult to decipher, and yet the artist has based his arrangement upon a carefully constructed scheme. Kenyon Cox thought it worth while in his analysis of Veronese to draw a diagram in order to demonstrate the severe laws of balance upon which Veronese relied for his effects. It seems beyond question that the picture has a greater interest when this fundamental structure is understood, since it gives the clue to the whole complex scheme. A similar analysis may be made a class exercise, the students being required to sketch from lantern slides the structure lines of simple compositions. A time limit of five or ten minutes may be set or the students may be left in uncertainty *when* the light will be extinguished. By this means they learn to think logically and to build up the "anatomy" of the picture in an organic fashion. Whatever may be the results on paper, the exercise necessitates concentration upon structure and upon logical development.

In the case of portraits or single figures the problem is one of placing on the canvas. Even persons whose profession brings them into direct touch with works of art have slight appreciation of this problem. This fact has recently been brought to my attention in a series of moving picture films taken from an important collection of paintings. Not only was the original proportion of the picture altered in nearly every case, but in many instances all the unoccupied spaces had been cut away so that a figure or a head thrust itself from the screen shorn of all charm. The idea that space, as such, might play an essential part in the effect had been completely ignored.

Here, too, sketching is not only the most satisfactory method by which the study of the adaptation of pictorial elements to a given space may be pursued, but it is the only means by which the instructor can learn whether or not the student has grasped the meaning of space relations and the uncompromising character of the decorator's problem. His sketch will show whether he has seen the lovely arabesque of the early decorative painters, or has grasped the meaning of foreground as Dewing uses it. How much the ink blots that Professor Dow's students make from Corot or Harpignies serve to show beauty of space division and the happy proportion between mass and line when nature is singing in tune! We must not overlook the fact that the student who analyzes Corot should learn not only how to see Corot, but how to see nature as an artist sees her.

Peculiarities of the individual artist may be studied with or without a pencil, but seeing is tremendously stimulated by the obligation to record—not in words, which are capable of many readings, but by a statement in line, tone, or color. "Placing on paper even a caricature of what one sees helps towards insight." The use made of the pencil by Holbein, Dürer, and Rembrandt differs from that of Mr. Woodbury and Mr. Sargent; the study of these records of personality helps the student to "realize quality and to relegate the facts to the substructure of the facts' place in art."

Furthermore, the student who is using this method is drawn into a "sympathetic kinship" with the master. He discovers how essential it is to get into the mood of the artist whose work he is attempting to understand. No slovenly mood will serve if one is to sketch from Botticelli's Dante drawings, nor will a laborious following of contours give the desired effect. "Drawing is a re-creative process that is both analytic and synthetic." The student must catch some of the warmth of the creative mind. Let him draw the flames of the Inferno or the tender grove in which Matilda bends to gather flowers, and he will understand why Vasari emphasized the virility of Botticelli's style. It is the expression of a state of mind and it is contagious. Drawing is a surer way than any other of reacting in one's own body to the attitude of *mind* as well as body depicted by the artist who lives in his work. Thus one may learn to read what Pliny calls the very thoughts of the artist.

To sum up:

1. Laboratory drawing holds the attention concentrated upon form rather than upon any extraneous interest or associated idea.
2. It facilitates the understanding of compositional problems with all the delicate adjustment of forms to space which they involve.
3. A more intimate acquaintance is gained with the expressive language of art, and the foundation is laid for the appreciation of "quality," so that in the final analysis one should be able not only to distinguish the line of this or that painter, but also "la ligne vivante" which characterizes great art.

Laboratory work is essentially a means to an end. For the student with artistic ability it can never become a substitute for real studio practice. But once initiated into this new world in which the senses play so large a part, the student experiences keen enjoyment, "and if perchance through this use of brush or pencil or modeling tool he finds awakening in himself a new interest in drawing or modeling not merely as an instrument by which to become better acquainted with the great artists, but also as an expressive medium of his own personality—what harm?"

E. R. A.